DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 328 AL 002 096

AUTHOR	Babcock, Sandra Scharff
TITLE	Paraphrastic Causatives.
Pub Date	28 Dec 68
Note	8p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, New York, December 28, 1968.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50
Descriptors	*Case (Grammar), *Deep Structure, *Sentence Structure, Structural Analysis, Syntax, Transformations (Language)
Identifiers	*Paraphrastic Causatives

Abstract

This paper examines, within the framework of case grammar, the alternant relationship that holds between the simplex in (1) "The thought frightened me" and (2) "The thought made me frightened," and between the simplex in (3) "John trembled with fear" and (4) "Fear made John tremble." It is shown that while the causative paraphrase in (2) is optional, the shape of (4) is determined by subject selection. The effects of this subject choice on the verb are described, and paraphrastic causatives are shown to be formally and semantically distinguished from complex causatives such as "I made John do his homework." The explanatory use of the paraphrastic interpretation is discussed, and rules are provided for the generation of sentences (3) and (4). Finally, it is noted that the explanation of these paraphrase relationships obliges us to revise our criteria for analyzing a sentence as complex in its deep structure. (Author/DO)

ED033328

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PARAPHRASTIC CAUSATIVES*

by

Sandra Scharff Babcock
2451 Fishinger Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221

*This is a copy of a paper delivered before the Linguistic Society of America on December 28, 1968.

AL 002 096

I am concerned now with the interpretation of paraphrastic causatives in case grammar. Causative paraphrases are complex alternants of sentences with simple verbs. Examples of these are (1) FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE, which is a paraphrastic alternant of (2) JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR, and (3) THE SUN MADE THE SEA GLISTEN, which is a paraphrase of (4) THE SEA GLISTENED IN THE SUN. These causatives are defined as syntactic paraphrases because they contain transformationally introduced constants, while all the elements of simple alternants are introduced in the base. To illustrate, let me note that (5) THE COLD FROZE JOHN and (6) JOHN FROZE FROM THE COLD are simple alternants because the preposition in the latter is introduced in the base. On the other hand, sentence (7) THE COLD MADE JOHN FREEZE is a paraphrastic alternant because the causative auxiliary make is transformationally introduced. I will try to demonstrate here that paraphrastic causatives and their alternants are simple in their deep structure. I begin my arguments by comparing paraphrastic causatives with complex causatives such as (8) I MADE JOHN DO HIS HOMEWORK.

The most important difference between the make of make John tremble and the make of make John do his homework is that in make tremble it is synonymous with cause, while in make do his homework it is synonymous with force. Another difference is that paraphrastic causatives, or 'causative inactives,' do not freely appear in the passive;

whereas what we might call 'causative actives' do appear in the passive. We can say (9) JOHN WAS MADE TO DO HIS HOMEWORK, but not (10) *JOHN WAS MADE TO TREMBLE BY FEAR or (11) *THE SEA WAS MADE TO GLISTEN BY THE SUN.

Another distinction that exists between paraphrastic causatives and causative actives is that although we can say (12) JOHN DID HIS HOMEWORK BECAUSE I MADE HIM and (13) JOHN DID HIS HOMEWORK BECAUSE HE WAS MADE TO, we cannot say (14) *JOHN TREMBLED BECAUSE FEAR MADE HIM or (15) *JOHN TREMBLED BECAUSE HE WAS MADE TO.

Yet another distinction between paraphrastic and active causatives lies in the categorial relationship of the participants to the verb phrase. In I MADE JOHN DO HIS HOMEWORK, there are two Agentive nouns: the superficial subject of make and the noun John, which bears an Agentive relationship to the subordinate clause and is the Dative object of make do his homework. In subject / object grammars the double categorial status of the noun John is explained this way: John is said to be the object of make do his homework and the logical, or deep structure, subject of do his homework. This analysis is extended, of course, to cover make John tremble. The noun John is said to be the object of make tremble and the logical, or deep structure, subject of tremble. Now, in the framework of case grammar--and I believe in fact -- the subject / object- argument is not relevant to the analysis of complexity. In

order to justify the analysis of a sentence as complex in its deep structure, we must show that there is at least one participant that plays one categorial role in the main clause, and the same or a different role in the subordinate clause. This is easy to show for I MADE JOHN DO HIS HOMEWORK, which has two Agentive nouns, first of all, -- enough reason for calling the sentence complex -- and which has one noun, John, which plays an Agentive role in the subordinate clause, and a Dative role in the main clause. Thus, we may properly say that I MADE JOHN DO HIS HOMEWORK is a complex sentence, and that the make of this sentence is among the verbs including its synonym force, which take sentential complements.

In FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE, however, we see a much different construction. The noun fear in the causative paraphrase bears the same Instrumental relationship to make tremble that it bears to tremble in the simple alternant. The noun John bears the same Locative relationship to make tremble in the causative paraphrase that it bears to tremble in the simple alternant. Therefore, since each categorial relationship occurs once in the simple alternant and once in the causative paraphrase, we must conclude that paraphrastic causatives are simple in their deep structure. Thus, the difference between FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE and JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR is one of subject selection. In fact, we can describe all of the paraphrastic causatives we have seen in terms of subject selection.

We say of a sentence like JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR that the Instrumental phrase with fear can be made the subject of the sentence if its status is registered in the verb. This registration has three effects: 1) the verb loses its capacity for absorbing the tense, requiring the insertion of make or cause in the Modality constituent; 2) the verb must be filled by a special causative form, which in this case is the infinitive; and 3) the paraphrastic causative sentence may not appear in the passive. (The derivation of FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE and JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR is illustrated in the handbook.)

In FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE the presence of make is obligatory. We cannot say (16) *FEAR TREMBLED JOHN. Tremble, thus, differs from open and close in (17) THE DOOR OPENED / CLOSED in that it has no simple active congener. But because of its alternation with make tremble, it does occur in sentences with superficial objects. Other verbs that behave like tremble and glisten are faint, flutter, shiver, and sweat. Sentence (18) JOHN FAINTED FROM HUNGER alternates with (19) HUNGER MADE JOHN FAINT; and (20) THE FLAG FLUTTERED IN THE BREEZE alternates with (21) THE BREEZE MADE THE FLAG FLUTTER.

In addition to verbs like these, there are some with simple active congeners which occur obligatorily in paraphrastic form in certain instances. This is the case with the verb wave when it has an Instrumental

subject. We can say (22) JOHN WAVED THE FLAG IN THE BREEZE, and (23) THE FLAG WAVED IN THE BREEZE, but not (24) *THE BREEZE WAVED THE FLAG. The paraphrastic alternant, (25) THE BREEZE MADE THE FLAG WAVE, is obligatory.

There are other verbs for which we may choose either the simple or the paraphrastic alternant. Recalling sentences (3) - (5) THE COLD FROZE JOHN, JOHN FROZE FROM THE COLD, and THE COLD MADE JOHN FREEZE, we note that the paraphrastic alternant is optional, though it is different from its simple transitive alternant in what Fillmore has called semantic focus and what I call configuration properties. Among the verbs that permit optional alternation of simple verb and paraphrastic causative are frighten, scare, distress, and terrify* We can say either

*But note that paraphrastic causative sentences (with make or cause) always require Instrumental subjects.

(26) THE THOUGHT FRIGHTENED ME or (27) THE THOUGHT MADE ME FRIGHTENED; and we can say either (28) IT DISTRESSED ME or (29) IT MADE ME DISTRESSED. These verbs, like wave, freeze, open, and close are inherent causatives. One of the striking properties of most causative verbs is the capacity for (optional or obligatory) paraphrase. Frighten and scare differ from open and wave in that the special required form of the verb is the participle. Whether the participle or the infinitive is required depends on the features of the verb and the selection of the subject.

Again we note that this analysis of make frightened is based on the fact that in THE THOUGHT FRIGHTENED JOHN and THE THOUGHT MADE JOHN FRIGHTENED the relationship of the nouns thought and John to the verb are the same. Both sentences are alternants of (30) JOHN WAS FRIGHTENED BY THE THOUGHT; and (31) *JOHN WAS MADE FRIGHTENED BY THE THOUGHT is ungrammatical.

There are still other types of paraphrastic causatives, of which I mention only one here: causatives of the type make happy and make sad. (32) I AM HAPPY / SAD TO HEAR THAT alternates with (33) IT MAKES ME HAPPY / SAD TO HEAR THAT; and let me stress the fact that the complexity of these sentences is due to their clausal Instrument, not to the presence of paraphrastic make. Sad is interpreted in these sentences as the obligatory alternant of sadden. That we can say (34) THE NEWS SADDENED JOHN, but not (35) *THE NEWS HAPPIED JOHN is an accident of contemporary English. Paraphrastic causatives of this type may appear in the passive with some types of subjects. (36) HE WAS MADE SAD BY THE NEWS is a grammatical sentence.

Now, as an illustration that paraphrastic causatives appear as alternants of simple sentences in other languages, let's turn to some examples in Spanish. We note that (37) A JUAN LE ENFURECE LA INJUSTICIA alternates with (38) A JUAN LE PONE FURIOSO LA INJUSTICIA; and

(39) A JUAN LE ENTRISTECIÓ LA NOTICIA alternates with (40) A JUAN LE PUSO TRISTE LA NOTICIA. (Incidentally, it should be noted that none of these Spanish sentences has a passive.) Once again, each categorial relationship occurs only once in these sentences, and in this fact lies the explanatory value of this interpretation: a simple sentence is one in which each of the categorial relationships occurs just once.

Finally, let me note that paraphrastic causatives are not unique in their superficial complexity. JOHN IS GOOD AT PLAYING TENNIS and JOHN IS A GOOD TENNIS PLAYER are alternants of JOHN PLAYS TENNIS WELL, and none of these, in my interpretation, is a complex sentence; JOHN IS SLOW TO LEARN and JOHN IS A SLOW LEARNER are alternants of JOHN LEARNS SLOWLY, and none of these is a complex sentence. JOHN GAVE MARY A BAD SCARE alternates with JOHN SCARED MARY BADLY; I HAD A BOOK STOLEN FROM ME alternates with A BOOK WAS STOLEN FROM ME,-and none of these is complex in its deep structure. In fact, to analyze JOHN IS GOOD AT PLAYING TENNIS as a complex sentence -- apparently the only analysis permitted in a subject / object grammar -- is to make it impossible to account for its paraphrase relationship to JOHN PLAYS TENNIS WELL. The explanation of these paraphrase and other alternant relationships obliges us to revise our criteria for what makes a sentence complex in its deep structure.